



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,061	02/12/2007	Hisashi Ohashi	SON-3206	6470
23353 7590 08/12/2010 RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
EXAMINER				
SONG, DAHEHO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2175				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/12/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/593,061

Applicant(s)

OHASHI, HISASHI

Examiner

DAEHO D. SONG

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2010.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 05/25/2010, Applicant amended Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 11-12, and argued against all rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 04/27/2010.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 2 and 3 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - There is a grammatical error on the phrase, "one of are assigned" in claim 2. Appropriate correction is required.
 - There is a spelling error on the phrase, "assigned to they third" in claim 3. Appropriate correction is required.
 - There is a grammatical error on the phrase, "one of are assigned" in claim 3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, Claims 1 and 6 recites "*second and third of the plurality of keys are respectively assigned two paired functions.*" However, while the Specification is replete with inclusion of paired functions, the Examiner has been unable to locate any support in the Specification that would specify one key is assigned two functions as one paired function. Instead, the Specification describes, "the function 'edit search +' has been assigned to the assign key 1" (see second para. on page 14); that is, one key is assigned to one function.

For the purpose of examination, Examiner will interpret the above recited limitation as "second and third of the plurality of keys are respectively assigned to **one of a paired function.**"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Maeda et al. (hereinafter Maeda): U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0015598.

Maeda expressly teaches:

Claim 1.

An electronic device having a display panel and a plurality of keys to which desired functions can be assigned, comprising:

display means for causing display of a plurality of items on the display panel (fig. 1; [0044][0045]: displaying a plurality items on the screen);

means for receiving a selection of a desired item from the plurality of items, after which the display means causing display of a setting screen corresponding to the selected desired item (figs. 2-4 & 18; [0046]-[0055]: selecting a item from the list of items, causing to display of a setting screen corresponding to the selected item); and assigning means for assigning of keys using the setting screen, wherein a first of the

plurality of keys is assigned a function for displaying the setting screen (figs. 6 & 18; [0063]: assigning a first key to a function for displaying the setting screen, such as "shortcut key registration" key for displaying a shortcut selection screen), and

wherein second and third of the plurality of keys are respectively assigned two paired functions (figs. 5-9 & 18; [0056]-[0067]: a second key, "2 IN 1" (BASIC 2) of fig. 9, is assigned to one of a paired function, such as "LEFT STAPLE", and a third key, for example "4 IN 1" (BASIC 3) of fig. 9, is assigned to the other of the paired function, such as "RIGHT STAPLE").

Claim 2. The electronic device as set forth in claim 1, wherein when one of said two paired functions are assigned a message prompts a user to assign the other of the two paired functions (figs. 7-8; [0066][0067]: prompting a message of inputting name to a user to assign "2 IN 1").

Claim 4. The electronic device as set forth in claim 1, wherein a sequence of user performed operations are stored and the stored operations are then assigned to said one of the plurality of keys ([0086]: storing the allocated shortcut keys and the set functions).

Claim 5. The electronic device as set forth in claim 1, wherein functions assigned to two

keys of the plurality of keys are swapped (figs. 6-8: swapping two keys for functions by means of utilizing "Shortcut Key Registration").

Claim 6. An electronic device having a display panel and a plurality of keys to which desired functions can be assigned, comprising:

display means for causing display of a plurality of items on the display panel (fig. 1; [0044][0045]: displaying a plurality items on the screen);

means for receiving a selection of a desired item from the plurality of items, after which the display means causes display of a setting screen corresponding to the selected desired item (figs. 2-4 & 18; [0046]-[0055]: selecting a item from the list of items, after causing to display of a setting screen corresponding to the selected item);

assigning means for assigning of keys using the setting screen,

wherein first of the plurality of keys is assigned a function for displaying the setting screen (figs. 6 & 18; [0063]: assigning a first key to a function for displaying the setting screen, such as "shortcut key registration" key for displaying a shortcut selection screen), *and*

wherein second and third of the plurality of keys are respectively assigned two paired functions (figs. 5-9 & 18; [0056]-[0067]: a second key, "2 IN 1" (BASIC 2) of fig. 9, is assigned to one of a paired function, such as "LEFT STAPLE", and a third key, for example "4 IN 1" (BASIC 3) of fig. 9, is assigned to the other of the paired function, such as "RIGHT STAPLE"); *and*

display means for displaying a second setting screen for items that are not included in

the plurality of items when the selected desired item is assigned to said one of the plurality of keys (figs. 6-7: displaying a second setting screen for items that are not included in the plurality of items, such as displaying a different setting screen when a key "Basic 2" is selected).

Claims 7, 9 and 10:

The subject matter recited in Claims 7, 9 and 10 corresponds to the subject matter recited in Claims 2, 4 and 5, respectively. Thus Maeda discloses every limitation of Claims 7, 9 and 10, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 2, 4 and 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Matsumoto et al. (hereinafter Matsumoto): U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0007487.

Claim 3:

As indicated in the above rejection, Maeda discloses every limitation of claim 1.

Maeda fails to disclose:

one of said two paired functions are assigned to the second key, the other of the two paired functions is automatically assigned to they third of the plurality of the keys.

Matsumoto expressly teaches:

one of said two paired functions are assigned to the second key, the other of the two paired functions is automatically assigned to they third of the plurality of the keys

([0068]: assigning an operation function to a key to be automatically effective without user interaction by means of automatic performance of registration operation).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system, disclosed in Maeda, to include:

one of said two paired functions are assigned to the second key, the other of the two paired functions is automatically assigned to they third of the plurality of the keys, for the purpose of providing functions of user's selected subject in a way of automatic operation, as taught in Matsumoto.

Claim 8:

The subject matter recited in Claim 8 corresponds to the subject matter recited in Claim 3. Thus Maeda in view of Matsumoto disclose every limitation of Claim 8, as indicated in the above rejections for Claim 3.

5. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Takagi et al. (hereinafter Takagi): U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0112248.

Claim 11:

Matsumoto teaches:

A method of assigning desired functions to a plurality of keys, comprising the steps of:
displaying a plurality of items (figs. 8-14; displaying multiple items on a display);
receiving a selection of a desired item from the plurality of items ([0014]: selecting a desired item in menu on the display)
receiving a selection of a key to which a function is assigned from the plurality of keys ([0014]: receiving a selection of a function key to be assigned);
assigning said function to the selected key ([0014]: assigning a function to the selected function key).

Matsumoto fails to disclose:

the function is a paired function.

Takagi expressly teaches:

the function is a paired function (fig. 3: a paired functions, such as a function of being BEGINNER MODE to be "ON" and another function of being BEGINNER MODE to be "OFF").

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system, disclosed in Matsumoto, to include: *the function is a paired function*, for the purpose of providing functions of user's selected subject in a way of alternative, as taught in Takagi.

Claim 12:

The subject matter recited in Claim 12 corresponds to the subject matter recited in Claim 11, including assigning the other function of the paired functions to the key. Thus Matsumoto and Takagi disclose every limitation of Claim 12, as indicated in the above rejections for Claim 11.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments against the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 103 with respect to Claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

7. Applicant's arguments against the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103 with respect to Claims 11 and 12 have been considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Matsumoto/Takagi fails to disclose assignment of a paired function.

The examiner disagrees.

As indicated in the above rejection for Claims 11 & 12, Matsumoto in view of Takagi teaches that a paired functions are assigned to function keys. More specifically, Matsumoto clearly teaches **assigning a function to a selected function key** (see [0014]).

Furthermore, Takagi expressly teaches assigning a key from the remote controller to a paired function. For example, a user can assign a key for BEGINNER MODE to be "ON" function, and a key for BEGINNER MODE to be "OFF" function. **Those "on" and "off" functions represent a paired function.** Another example, the

user can assign a key for VOICE OUTPUT to be "STEREO" function, and a key to be "SURROUND" function. Again, **those "stereo" and "surround" function represent a paired function** (see fig. 3 and [0038]).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAEHO D. SONG whose telephone number is (571)272-7524. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:30-6:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boris Pesin can be reached on 5712724070. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DaeHo D Song/
Examiner, Art Unit 2172

/Boris Pesin/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174